

SHANNON LISS-RIORDAN (SBN 310719)  
(sliss@llrlaw.com)  
THOMAS FOWLER (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
(tfowler@llrlaw.com)  
LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.  
729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000  
Boston, MA 02116  
Telephone: (617) 994-5800  
Facsimile: (617) 994-5801

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Francisco Rodriguez,  
on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Case No. 3:22-cv-7222

FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of  
himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TWITTER, INC. and PRO UNLIMITED, INC.

Defendants

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND  
JURY DEMAND**

1. VIOLATION OF WARN ACT  
(29 U.S.C. §§ 2101 *ET SEQ.*)
2. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA  
WARN ACT (CAL. LAB. CODE §§  
1400 *ET SEQ.*)
3. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES  
AND BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY  
UPON TERMINATION (CAL. LAB.  
CODE §§ 201, 203 AND 227.3)

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Plaintiff Francisco Rodriguez files this Class Action Complaint against  
3 Defendants Twitter, Inc. (“Twitter”) and PRO Unlimited, Inc. d/b/a Magnit (“PRO” or “Magnit”),  
4 on his own behalf and on behalf of potentially thousands of other employees, challenging  
5 Defendants’ violation of the federal Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29  
6 U.S.C. § 2101 *et seq.* (the “WARN Act”), and, for those employees who worked in California,  
7 the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400 *et seq.* (the “California WARN Act”), as well  
8 as failure to provide the employees’ final pay and benefits on the same day that they were  
9 terminated, in violation of the California Labor Code §§ 201, 203, and 227.3.  
10

11 2. As described further below, Plaintiff, along with thousands of other similarly  
12 situated employees, were employed by Twitter through Magnit, a payroll administration  
13 company. While these employees were classified as employees of Magnit, the duties that they  
14 performed for Twitter were indistinguishable from the employees who were employed directly  
15 by Twitter. Twitter referred to these employees as its “contingent workforce.”

16 3. Multi-billionaire Elon Musk recently purchased Twitter and immediately began  
17 laying off half its workforce in the first week of November 2022. On November 12, 2022,  
18 Twitter laid off potentially thousands of employees (reportedly between 4,400 and 5,500) who  
19 worked for Twitter through Magnit, including Plaintiff, without providing them with the required  
20 notice under the federal and California WARN Acts or any payment in lieu of notice. The  
21 employees also did not receive their full final pay, benefits, and expense reimbursement the same  
22 day that they were terminated, as required by California law.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**II. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Francisco Rodriguez is an adult resident of Culver City, California. Plaintiff Rodriguez worked for Twitter through Magnit as a Gaming Partnership Coordinator, assigned to Twitter's office in Santa Monica, California, from approximately November 17, 2021, until he was laid off on November 12, 2022.

2. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a Rule 23 class action on behalf of all affected employees who were employed by Twitter through Magnit and were terminated in connection with Elon Musk's slashing of Twitter's workforce, across the United States (with respect to the federal WARN Act claim) and in California (with respect to the California claims).

3. Defendant Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter") is a Delaware corporation, headquartered in San Francisco, California.

4. Defendant PRO Unlimited, Inc. d/b/a Magnit ("Magnit"), is a New York corporation, headquartered in Bethpage, New York.

**III. JURISDICTION**

5. This Court has jurisdiction over this proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(5).

6. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiff's state law claims, because those claims derive from a common nucleus of operative facts with Plaintiff's federal claim.

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Twitter, as it is headquartered in this District and conducts substantial business operations in this District.

8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Magnit, as it conducts substantial business operations in this District.

**IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

9. Twitter is a social media company that employs thousands of people across the United States.

10. In addition to individuals employed directly by Twitter, Twitter has employed thousands of employees through a payroll administration company, Magnit. There is no distinction between the work performed by Twitter's direct employees and the work performed by the individuals whom Twitter paid through Magnit. Twitter dealt directly with these employees throughout the hiring process, including recruiting them and negotiating their compensation. These employees were directly supervised by Twitter managers, were assigned to Twitter offices, and Twitter provided all equipment used for work.

11. In April 2022, it was announced that multi-billionaire Elon Musk would be purchasing the company.

12. Following the purchase of the company by Elon Musk in late October 2022, Musk immediately began a mass layoff that has been reported to have affected half of Twitter's workforce. See Kate Conger, Ryan Mac, and Mike Isaac, Confusion and Frustration Reign as Elon Musk Cuts Half of Twitter's Staff, NEW YORK TIMES (November 4, 2022), <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/04/technology/elon-musk-twitter-layoffs.html>.

13. Twitter began its mass layoff by terminating thousands of employees who Twitter employed directly during late October and early November 2022.

14. Then, beginning on November 12, 2022, Twitter began laying off its employees who were paid through Magnit.

15. Plaintiff, like potentially thousands of other Twitter employees who were paid through Magnit, received an email on November 12, 2022, stating that he was being laid off, effective November 14, 2022.

1           16.     Twitter did not give 60 days advance written notice to the employees paid through  
2 Magnit who Twitter laid off, as required by the federal WARN Act, and for employees in  
3 California, the California WARN Act. Nor were the affected employees given pay in  
4 substitution for federal or California WARN Act notice.

5           17.     These layoffs of employees who were paid through Magnit are part of the same  
6 mass layoffs affecting employees directly employed by Twitter. Twitter is a joint employer of  
7 the employees who were paid through Magnit, and thus Twitter is likewise responsible for  
8 complying for federal and state labor laws protecting these employees, including the federal and  
9 California WARN Acts and the California Labor Code.

10           18.     In addition, neither Twitter nor Magnit provided full final pay, benefits, and  
11 expense reimbursement to these employees on their last day of employment, as required by the  
12 California Labor Code. To date, these employees have still not received these full payments.

13           19.     Plaintiff is concerned that, absent court intervention, Defendants will seek  
14 releases from laid off employees without informing them of their rights, statutory obligations, or  
15 the pendency of this case. Plaintiff therefore seeks immediate relief to ensure that Defendants do  
16 not violate the law and then seek to obtain releases from potentially thousands of employees who  
17 do not have notice of their rights or the pendency of the claims brought here on their behalf.

18           20.     Indeed, Elon Musk engaged in similar behavior with respect to mass layoffs  
19 conducted earlier this year at another company he owns, Tesla. In the summer of 2022, Tesla  
20 engaged in mass layoffs without providing advanced written notice as required by the federal and  
21 California WARN Acts. Former Tesla employees brought a suit against Tesla for these  
22 violations. See Lynch et al. v. Tesla, Inc., Civ. Act. No., 1:22-cv-00597-RP (W.D. Tex.). Tesla  
23 sought to obtain full releases of all federal and California WARN Act claims in exchange for  
24 small severance payments for less than the employees were legally entitled to, as alleged in the  
25 federal lawsuit. (Tesla offered one or two weeks' severance pay, rather than the 60 days' pay  
26  
27  
28

1 required to satisfy the federal and California WARN Acts). See Lynch, 2022 WL 4295295, at  
2 \*1-4.) A federal court ruled that Tesla’s conduct was “misleading because [the separation  
3 agreements] fail to inform potential class members of this lawsuit and the rights that they are  
4 potentially giving up under the WARN Act.” Id. at \*4.

5 21. With respect to laid off employees who were paid directly by Twitter, Twitter  
6 stated that it would begin distributing severance agreements, including releases of claims,  
7 beginning last week. However, after employees filed a class action lawsuit and emergency  
8 motion seeking to block the distribution of releases without employees being informed of their  
9 claims and the pendency of the case, see Cornet et al v. Twitter, Inc., C.A. No. 3:22-cv-06857-JD  
10 (N.D. Cal.) (Dkts. 6 and 7), Twitter agreed not to distribute releases until after the plaintiffs’  
11 motion could be heard (assuming it could be heard promptly).

12 22. In this case as well, Plaintiff seeks immediate relief to ensure that Defendants do  
13 not violate the law and then seek to obtain releases from the potentially thousands of employees  
14 who do not have notice of their rights or the pendency of the claims brought here on their behalf.  
15

16  
17 **COUNT I**  
18 **Federal WARN Act**

19 Plaintiff and other affected employees who have worked for Twitter and been paid  
20 through Magnit have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the  
21 federal WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 et. seq. 24. Defendants are subject to the notice and back  
22 pay requirements of the federal WARN Act because Twitter and Magnit are business enterprises  
23 that employed 100 or more employees, excluding part-time employees, and/or, employed 100 or  
24 more employees who in the aggregate work at least 4,000 hours per week (exclusive of  
25 overtime), as defined in the WARN Act. 29 U.S.C. §§ 2101(1)(A) and(B). Defendants are  
26 engaged in conducting mass layoffs but have not provided affected employees with the required  
27 notice under the federal WARN Act.

**COUNT II**  
**California WARN Act**

Plaintiff and other employees who have worked for Twitter out of California and paid through Magnit have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400 *et seq.* Defendants are subject to the notice and back pay requirements of the California WARN Act because Twitter and Magnit are business enterprises that employed 75 or more employees, as defined in the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400(a). Defendants are engaged in conducting mass layoffs but have not provided all affected employees with the required notice under the California WARN Act.

**COUNT III**  
**Failure to Provide All Final Pay and Accrued Benefits Immediately Upon Termination**  
**California Labor Code §§ 201, 203, 227.3**

Plaintiff and other employees who have worked for Twitter out of California and paid through Magnit and who were laid off have been entitled to immediate receipt of their full final pay, accrued benefits, and expense reimbursement, pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 203, and 227.3. Defendants have terminated these employees but failed to provide to them their full final pay, accrued benefits, and expense reimbursement immediately upon termination.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff requests a trial by jury on these claims.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court enter the following relief:

- a. Declare and find that the Defendants have violated the federal WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 *et seq.*, and the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1400 *et seq.*;
- b. Declare and find that the Defendants have violated the California Labor code §§ 201, 203, and 227.3.
- c. Certify this case as a class action;
- d. Award compensatory damages and penalties, in an amount according to proof;
- e. Award pre- and post-judgment interest;
- f. Award reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses; and
- g. Award any other relief to which the Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of himself  
and all others similarly situated,

By his attorneys,

/s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan  
Shannon Liss-Riordan, SBN 310719  
Thomas Fowler (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.  
729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000  
Boston, MA 02116  
(617) 994-5800  
Email: sliss@llrlaw.com; tfowler@llrlaw.com

Dated: November 16, 2022